REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the Office Action dated April 16, 2009, claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were rejected.

No amendment is made herein.

Based on the following Remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections, are requested.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

A supplemental information disclosure statement is submitted herewith including the copies of references. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate the consideration of the references submitted herewith in the next communication to the Applicants.

Double Patenting

In the Office Action, claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 29, 43-52, 54, 56 and 58 of copending Application Serial No. 09/905,014 (now issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,505,406); and claims 1, 3, 12, 13, 15, 17-22, 25, 32, 40-42, 59, 62, 63, 71 and 96-98 of copending Application Serial No. 10/642,532. These rejections are obviated in view of terminal disclaimers submitted herewith.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

7,203,186 ("Fuller") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,655,013 ("Gainsboro"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, specifically recites:

> a first processor-based system coupled to a plurality of telephone terminals disposed within said prison facility, the first processor-based system disposed at the prison facility, said first processor-based system transmitting first voice signals associated with one or more of said plurality of telephone terminals via a digital data link; and
>
> a second processor-based system coupled to said first processor-based system and disposed remotely from said prison facility, said second processor-based system establishing calls to called parties . . . ***the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals from the called parties received via the carrier network to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the first processor-based system via the digital data link, the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls***. (emphasis added).

Per claim 1, the call processing system includes a first processor-based system and a second processor-based system. The first processor-based system is located within the prison facility whereas the second processor-based system is located remotely from the prison facility. The first processor-based system and the second processor-based system are coupled by a digital data link to transmit digital versions of voice signals. The second processor-based system receives first voice signals from the first processor-based system and transmits the first voice signals over a carrier network. The second processor-based system also performs the functions of (i) receiving second non-VoIP voice signals from the carrier network and converting the second non-VoIP voice signals into second VoIP voice signals, and (ii) detecting fraudulent or unauthorized call activity by monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals.

The feature of "the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals . . . to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the

first processor-based system . . . the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" is advantageous, among other reasons, because the second processor-based system may (i) provide shared call processing functionality (see, for example, paragraph [0055] of the specification) and (ii) more accurately detect the fraudulent or unauthorized call activity (see, for example, paragraph [0052] of the specification).

Attention is directed to the fact that claim 1 recites that the second processor-based system performs at least two functions: (i) "[convert] second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals . . . to second VoIP voice signals" and (ii) "[monitor] the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls." Fuller fails to disclosure this feature. It is admitted in the Office Action that Fuller fails to disclose a second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls. Hence, Fuller fails to disclose any system that converts non-VoIP voice signals to VoIP voice signals, and also detects fraudulent or unauthorized call activity based on non-VoIP voice signals.

Gainsboro also fails to disclose this feature. Gainsboro at best discloses a TMU that monitors fraudulent or unauthorized call activity based on analog/POTS signals. The TMU of Gainsboro, however, does not perform conversion between non-VoIP voice signals and VoIP voice signals. Therefore, Gainsboro fails to disclose any system that converts non-VoIP voice signals to VoIP voice signals, and also detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity by monitoring non-VoIP voice signals.

Nor can Fuller and Gainsboro be combined to achieve the feature of "the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice

signals . . . to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the first processor-based system . . . the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls," as recited in claim 1. If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious. See MPEP § 2143.01 VI. Fuller uses VoIP technology based on digital technology to service multiple telephones. For this purpose, Fuller uses various digital call processing components such as voice gateway 44, DSLAM 40, and ADSL modem 22. In contrast, Gainsboro is based on analog/POTS system to service multiple telephones. For this purpose, Gainsboro uses analog call processing components such as TMU. Because Fuller and Gainsboro are based on different call processing system, the principle of operation of Fuller and/or Gainsboro must be modified for combination. Hence, the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render claim 1 *prima facie* obvious.

Assuming, *arguendo*, that Fuller and Gainboro can be combined, the resulting system would not include the feature of "the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals . . . to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the first processor-based system . . . the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls," as recited in claim 1. The TMU of Gainsboro is associated with a single institution. See Gainsboro, col. 3, ll. 16-28. The voice gateway 44 of Fuller, on the other hand, is provided by an independent service provider and is shared by multiple subscribers. See Fuller, col. 6, ll. 57-60. That is, the voice gateway 44 of Fuller is not dedicated to an institution. Rather, ADSL modem 22 in Fuller is located in a single premise 16 (institution) to serve multiple IP telephones

18 in the premise 16. Hence, if Gainsboro is combined with Fuller, the TMU of Gainsboro would replace the ADSL modem 22, not the voice gateway 44. The ADSL modem 22 in Fuller routes and processes only VoIP signals. Hence, the combination of Gainsboro and Fuller would detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity based on VoIP signals, and not non-VoIP signals.

Therefore, Gainsboro and Fuller, alone or in combination, fail to disclose the feature of "the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals . . . to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the first processor-based system . . . the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Gainsboro and Fuller.

Claims 2-14, 16, 19 and 41 depend from claim 1; and therefore, the arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 2-1, 16, 19 and 41. Accordingly, claims 2-14, 16, 19 and 41 are also patentably distinguishable from Gainsboro and Fuller.

Similarly, independent claim 21 recites the feature of "the call processing platform . . . converting the second non-VoIP voice signals to second VoIP voice signals for transmission over the digital data links to the plurality of prison facilities, the call processing platform monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls . . . ." Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 21 and its dependent claims 22, 24, 30-32 and 42. Accordingly, claims 22, 24, 30-32 and 42 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Fuller and Gainsboro.

Independent claim 34 also recites the feature of "in a centralized call processing platform . . . converting the second non-VoIP voice signal to a second VoIP voice signal for transmission

over the digital data link to the one of the plurality of telephone terminals; and monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signal for fraudulent or unauthorized call activity." Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 34 and its dependent claims 36, 38-40 and 43. Accordingly, claims 34 and its dependent claims 36, 38-40 and 43 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Fuller and Gainsboro.

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-40 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36, and 38-43, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejection to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Robert L. Rae, et al.

Date: July 13, 2009 By: /Dohyun Ahn/

Dohyun Ahn, Reg. No. 63,237
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7291
Fax: (650) 938-5200